8418.c.7

MARTIN's HOBBY
Houghed and Pounded:

OR,

LETTERS
ON
THELYPHTHORA,
TO A FRIEND,

ON THE SUBJECTS OF

MARRIAGE AND POLYGAMY:

WITH OTHER

INCIDENTAL AND CURSORY OBSERVATIONS.

And the LORD said unto Joshua, Thou shalt hough their horses, and burn their chariots with fire.

And Joshua did unto them as the LORD bade him: he houghed their horses. JOSHUA xi. 6. 9.

Whatever moderation or charity we may owe to men's persons, we owe none at all to their *errors*, and to that *frame* which is built on, and supported by them.

Bishop BURNET.

LONDON:
Printed for J. BUCKLAND, Paternoster-Row.
MDCCLXXXI.

[Price 1*s*. 6*d*.]

ERRATA.

Page 1. line 12. *for* for though his, *read* but though the *author's*.
11.——14. *for* carry, *read* curry.
14.——12. *for* indiſputably, *read* indiſſolubly.
27.—— 3. *read* who of himſelf, ſays.
40.——17. *after* CHARYBDE, *read* indeed THELYPH you may forbear, &c.
45.——24. *for* hatch, *read* hutch.
47.——24. *for* this law, *read* the law.
25. *for* the man, *read* a man.
27. *for* culprit, *read* ſeducer.
52.——15. *for* volume, *read* volumes.

LETTER I.

DEAR SIR,

THERE are, perhaps, but few publications that are not of ſome importance to their readers; but this importance equally reſpects truth and error; and the more fundamental *theſe* are, the more intereſting and important the publication: therefore, we may grant that THELYPHTHORA is *one* of the moſt important and intereſting publications that has appeared ſince the days of the *Proteſtant Reformation;* as it very materially concerns the *preſent peace*, and *future happineſs* of mankind. For, though his pompous profeſſion is *, to trace the *cauſes* of *female ruin*, and to point out a *remedy* againſt it; yet, throughout his whole Book, he has reduced

* See the Advertiſement which follows the Title-page.

it to the *one ſingle cauſe* of the man's abandoning the virgin he had *ſeduced*; and the *remedy* he points out, is the introduction of POLYGAMY: but how well this comports with the *peace*, *good order*, *comfort*, and *well-fare of ſociety*, a very little *ſerious* conſideration is ſufficient to determine. Alſo, with a like fallacious blandiſhment, he ſays *, "It "is the purpoſe of the following pages, to "ſet forth the *Divine Law*, as the contriv-"ance of INFINITE WISDOM, for the ſecu-"rity, peace, preſervation and protection of "the *female ſex*:" which is not true; for who can be ſo blind as not to ſee, that the ſecurity and peace of the female ſex in general, is no part of his ſyſtem: but, on the contrary, his whole drift is towards the protection and preſervation *only* of a few comparatively, and thoſe of the *lewder ſort*; and not without a contemptuous diſregard for the ſecurity and peace of all the *reſt* †? We may therefore take his word for it, that he is no *true* prophet, though he entertains not the

* See Dedication, p. ix.

† An inſtance of this we have in a curious note, p. 182, where the lawful wife is ranked with monopoliſts, who are the bane of trade, and the peſts of ſociety.

leaſt

leaſt doubt, that a century hence, the world may *either* wonder at the *man* who had WILDNESS enough to attack the *preſent ſyſtem* of things, with regard to *marriage*; or, that there were found people, who were ABSURD enough to abuſe him for it. "THIS "TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN *," *ſays he.* Then, firſt, it may concern the ſchool-boys, to laugh at the profound ſagacity of this *wizard*,—with his *either*—no doubt, the world may do *either* the one or the other: but, leſt the more ſage and elder part of the world ſhould poſſibly miſtake, and not account of him as a filthy dreamer, or as one of the lying Prophets, that perſuaded Ahab to go up, that he might fall at Ramoth-Gilead, he choſe to be his own confuter, by aſſerting, in expreſs terms, that Polygamy, (which is the centre of his whole building), conſidered in itſelf, is one of the laſt things a man ſhould think of, who wiſhes and aims at the happineſs of a domeſtic life. How can the world, then, but wonder, even to aſtoniſhment, that there was found an author, who was ABSURD enough to call ſuch a ſyſ-

* See note, p. 209.

tem the contrivance of INFINITE WISDOM, which he confeſſes to be one of the laſt things that any wiſe man would ever think of putting into practice.—Here is evidently a miſtake, either on the one ſide or the other; for, if *Polygamy* is founded on the baſis of the Divine Law, it cannot be ſuch an unhappy michief-making *thing* as he imagines; the practice of it muſt be holy, juſt and good, like the law on which it is founded; and what is good eſſentially, muſt be good for all, and good alſo in its conſequences: *The ſtatutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart; the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether; more to be deſired than gold, yea, than much fine gold; ſweeter alſo than honey, and the droppings of the honey-comb: alſo, in keeping of them there is great reward:* ſo that he is either too ſuſpicious, and caſts an unjuſt reflection on the practice of *Polygamy*; or elſe, inſtead of its being eſteemed the contrivance of INFINITE WISDOM, not only the preſent age, but the world, a century hence, will be apt to conclude, that the Author of ſuch an ABSURDITY muſt needs be a WILD man *.

* See note, p. 209.

Perhaps

Perhaps there are few men but are fondly attached to ſome one foible or other, which may be very properly called their *Hobby-horſe:* thus, any bit of inſignificance, if it bear the inſignia of antiquity, is important in the eſteem of an Antiquary; to obtain a drawer, or a room filled with theſe, curiouſly papered up and labelled, is his *Hobby*; and our author has amply and plainly diſcovered that THELYPHTHORA is *his*. Wherefore, as I find him neighing and prancing among the cavalry of the enemies of Iſrael, he ought not to fare better than *thoſe* which Joſhua took at the waters of Merom: but, alas! how can I do this thing? I find he has ſerved me as the Philiſtines ſerved Iſrael; for there was no ſmith found throughout all the land of Iſrael *(for the Philiſtines ſaid, leſt the Hebrews make them ſwords or ſpears)*; for the like reaſon, no doubt, it is, that THELYPH declines an appeal, in any one point, to the authority of even the beſt *Tranſlations*, together with the wiſeſt, beſt, and moſt admired *Commentators:* muſt I then grow out of conceit with my *Henry* and *Gill*, and what is more pinching, my BIBLE too—containing the OLD and NEW TESTAMENTS; newly

tranſlated out of the ORIGINAL TONGUES, and with the former TRANSLATIONS *diligently* compared and reviſed? Theſe are things too conſiderable to be yielded on the firſt ſummons. * Mark, I pray you, and ſee how this *man* ſeeketh miſchief; like *Benhadad* King of Syria, he is not content to have only the ſilver and gold of our diligent and laborious COMMENTATORS, but he will needs take away that pleaſant thing the BIBLE too: but I may not hearken nor conſent to this; therefore let him ſee to it, that the charge of *not thinking as the Bible ſpeaks*, and of making *the Bible ſpeak as they think*, doth not apply cloſer to himſelf, than unto thoſe excellently learned and judicious men he is ſo free in cenſuring. Wherefore, it may not be amiſs to remind him of that ſage counſel of the King of Iſrael, *let not him that girdeth on his harneſs, boaſt himſelf as he that putteth it off.* Though I have ſeen all this great multitude of words, concerning the CAUSES, EFFECTS, CONSEQUENCES, or the EFFECTS, and EFFECTS, of *Female Ruin*, together with the PREVENTION and RE-

* 1 Kings xx. 7.

MEDY, that is, the PREVENTION and PREVENTION, which muſt be the *Remedy*; for I ſee no other *remedy* for female ruin but the *prevention* of it; and this conſidered under ſeveral heads, one of which is on WHOREDOM and FORNICATION, or on WHOREDOM and WHOREDOM, I find the leſs reaſon to fear, becauſe, by the *Title*, ſo encumbered, we may judge he has too much *luggage* in his camp, and thence it may be expected, the whole hoſt will be found to be but *confuſed* and *undiſciplined*; far unlike to thoſe warlike ſons of Iſrael, that with martial *dexterity* could keep *rank*; and what does this preſage, but as eaſy a victory as Ahab obtained over the Syrian rabble, even by the young men of the princes of the provinces. Nevertheleſs, Sir, I muſt not deny but I was, like Ahab, ſtruck with ſome degree of panic; for, thought I, if the *Tranſlators* were men of ſuch a caſt, that *only* in a Treatiſe on the Cauſes and Prevention of Female Ruin, the *Writer* would not *venture* to reſt any one point on the authority of even the beſt *Tranſlation*; alſo, that the wiſeſt and beſt, the moſt diligent and laborious, of the *Commentators*, were ſo *ſilly* and *nonſenſical*, or elſe ſo

wicked, that he found little encouragement to reſt any thing on their *authority*; who can ſafely truſt them in matters of the higheſt importance? but my fears are relieved; for, by THELYPH himſelf, the authority that ſet forth the BIBLE, as an exact TRANSLATION of the HOLY SCRIPTURES, and appointed it to be read in churches, is confeſſed to be truly venerable *: wherefore we may yet have great hope, that the Church of England ſhall reap good fruit thereby, notwithſtanding the bitter cenſures, and uncharitable imputations of this ſelf-conceited Brother: and as to the Author himſelf, I am credibly informed, that one of its preſent dignitaries ſaid, "He really thought Mr. "M——n had been a better ſcholar."

I am, &c.

* See p. 6. of the Introduction.

LETTER II.

DEAR SIR,

I Find that the *Author* of THELYPHTHORA has condeſcended to allow me two things; but why ſhould I receive that as a matter of bounty, which is really my own by right of inheritance? however, ſince he does not deny me the privilege, I ſhall not ſtand on punctilios: the things I mean are theſe; 1ſt, If I ſhould find any thing that is *wrong*, or detect any thing that is *falſe*, I may freely ſet it down to his account *. 2dly, I may exerciſe the privilege, as he hath done, to ſearch, think, and judge, for myſelf †.

Therefore, with the confidence that the love of truth inſpires, I will now proceed to the GRAND QUESTION to be *tried* ‡; Is it not this? Whether a SYSTEM filled with *obligation* and *reſponſibility* of *men* to *women*, and of *women* to *men*, even unto death itſelf, and this eſtabliſhed by INFINITE WISDOM,

* P. xvi. Preface. † P. xxii. Id. ‡ P. xxiii. Id.

is not better calculated to prevent the ruin of the *female ſex*, with all its horrid conſequences, both to the public and individuals, than a SYSTEM of *human contrivance*, where neither *obligation* nor *reſponſibility* are to be found, either of *men* to *women*, or of women to men, in inſtances of the moſt important concern to *both*, but more eſpecially to the *weaker ſex?* Now, Sir, let me aſk,—Is this the queſtion, and is it truly ſtated? why then honeſt THELYPHTHORA's *foes* are *fools*; I muſt needs give him the right-hand of fellowſhip;—where, oh! where ſhall I find a compliment handſome enough on this GRAND occaſion?—I feel myſelf too defective; but there is a wiſe woman in Tekoah; I can do no leſs than adopt her eloquent addreſs to the Royal Pſalmiſt: *As thy ſoul liveth, my Lord, O King, none can turn to the right hand or to the left, from ought that my Lord the King hath ſpoken:* for, to be ſure, a SYSTEM eſtabliſhed by INFINITE WISDOM, claims the preference to a SYSTEM of human *contrivance*, or rather of human *folly* without any *contrivance*, where neither *obligation* nor *reſponſibility* are to be found. But, alas! this is not a true caſe;—the queſtion is miſ-ſtated, mau-

gre its GRANDEUR;—I ſee through the thin diſguiſe;- there is treachery, O Ahaziah!—it is no other than a falſe light ſet up at the entrance of both *volumes*, to dazzle the eyes of the Reader; which may be fitly compared to a *Mauſoleum*, that points at the tall roof of ſome Abbey Church, with words like theſe engraven deep on the gliſtering marble, and gilt with gold—"Here lies the great;" to which the Poet has once for all replied:

"——falſe marble, where?
"Nothing but poor and ſordid duſt lies here."

So, notwithſtanding the uncommon pains which hath been taken to carry, and dreſs, and diſguiſe this Hobby, neither his ſleek ſkin nor ſilken trappings are ſufficient to hide his imperfections: he has an Amoritiſh trot; and as to pedigree, his grand dam is of an Hittitiſh breed; beſides, he is not ſure footed;—I have ſeen him ſtumble more than once; and if you obſerve him nicely, you may ſee that he *cuts* and *kicks* one foot againſt another: nevertheleſs, his *Maſter* has taught him to make ſome bold leaps, which cannot but amaze the beholders; but what completes his character, and which was ſome-

how

how or other extorted from his Maſter himſelf; it is no leſs than this, that whoſoever ſhould have the temerity to venture on his back, had beſt make his will, and prepare to take leave of even the leaſt pretence to domeſtic happineſs for ever. Now what ſhould be done with ſuch a *tit*, which is neither fit for the road nor the riding-ſchool? Shall this *vicious* thing be ſuffered to roam at large, to *vex* and *frighten* every virtuous wife in her peaceful walks, by the ſide of thoſe ſoft meandering rills, that glide through the flowery meads of true conjugal felicity? Oh! no; the principles of nature, piety, and moral goodneſs, all forbid it. Wherefore, fear not; though he ſeems violent and boiſterous, a little diligence will be ſufficient to check his brutely impetuoſity; for I obſerve him already caught round in the trammels of his own contradictions and abſurdities; which ere long ſhall be made to appear. In the mean time I remain, *&c.*

LET-

LETTER III.

DEAR SIR,

WHETHER a SYSTEM of laws—the contrivance of INFINITE WISDOM, can be amended by any human contrivances, is a queſtion indecent to be propoſed; but whether or not THELYPHTHORA has rightly defined the inſtitution of marriage, according to God's word, or whether Polygamy is therein written, to be lawful or forbidden, are queſtions of importance to be decided. Let us then collect his *definition* of the *ordinance* of *marriage*; and then examine whether it is *homogeneous* and *conſiſtent* in all its parts; which is the proper touchſtone of *truth*,—but if this ſhould be *wanting*, and he ſhould be found *claſhing*, we may be confident, that it ſprung from no higher a ſource, than his own *mere human* and *carnal conceit*.

When the great and all-wiſe Creator had formed man upon the earth, *male* and *female*, he *bleſſed them, and ſaid unto them, be fruitful and multiply, and repleniſh the earth*, Gen. i.

28. This command was to be fulfilled in a way of God's own appointment; that is to ſay, by *the union of the man* and *woman*, in *perſonal knowledge of each other*. "This," ſays he, "is the only *marriage-ordinance* "which we find revealed in the ſacred Scrip-"tures." And, not content with this, he ſays farther, That, "*wherever* this *union* ſhould "come to paſs, though *two* diſtinct and inde-"pendent perſons before, they were now to be-"come as *one* *. *They ſhall be one fleſh*, Gen. "ii. 24. and ſo indiſputably *one* as to be inſe-"parable: *What God hath joined together, let* "*not man put aſunder*, Matth. xix. 6." Again, ſays he, "It appears that the eſſence "of marriage ſimply conſiſts in the union of "the man and woman as one body †. The "ſimple act of union is the ordinance of "marriage, the only *one* which God ever "ordained. This is the primary inſtitution; "and nothing elſe is eſſential to conſtitute a "marriage; but this is ‡. But," ſays he, "when men corrupted their ways upon the "earth, this ordinance of marriage was, as "every other divine inſtitution, corrupted,

* See chap. i. p. 18. † P. 21. ‡ See p. 24, 25. 27.

"per-

" perverted, and abuſed:" and, as for the abuſe which any ſubject herein treated may be liable to, what is not abuſed? But what poſſible abuſe can there be of his only ordinance of marriage? except we deem an honourable pre-engagement, or what the Scriptures call, eſpouſing or betrothing, to be an abuſe. To entice, or even forcibly to lay hold on, and lie with a virgin, unbetrothed, he calls the taking poſſeſſion of her, according to the primary inſtitution. Whatever abuſes then, may take place, this ſeems the leaſt liable to abuſe. Or, how can the practice of Polygamy be abuſed otherwiſe than by the chaſte and lawful converſation of a man with one wife? *Happy man!* who has ſo elucidated the Scriptures, that the ſubjects treated on can no otherwiſe be abuſed, than by an orderly, chaſte, and righteous conduct: for, as the beſt things are abuſed by the worſt, ſo the worſt can only be contradicted and oppoſed by thoſe things that are beſt.

I ſhould now proceed to conſider this definition of the only ordinance of marriage; but, as there are ſome incidental points which deſerve not to be paſſed over, the ſubject of

matrimony muſt be deferred for a ſeaſon: though I ſcruple not to advertiſe beforehand, that THELYPH'S *Levite* and *Teraphim* of *Marriage* and *Polygamy*, will prove to be neither Jachin nor Boaz, but what may be as eaſily ſhaken and carried away, as were poor *Micah*'s gods which he had made; and then, like *Micah*, he may cry out, *What have I more?* and what is this that ye ſay unto me, *What aileth thee?*

Whether or not it proceeds from THELYPH'S good breeding, or that he ſuſpected the light and ſplendour of his Chapters on Marriage and Polygamy would be hurtful, ſhould they beam too ſuddenly on his Readers, he has introduced them with peculiar caution and addreſs. Firſt, a ſpecious ADVERTISEMENT ſtands to invite us in, with a promiſe that our entertainment ſhall be, not only *wholeſome*, but as *pleaſant* as nectar: next, a DEDICATION ſpeaks as fair, and wiſhes only to have adopted the SYSTEM of *heavenly wiſdom* which adorns the pages of the SACRED VOLUME: then, a PREFACE, plauſible indeed, pretending the good and welfare of *ſociety:* alſo, the better to prepare our eyes againſt the ſudden blaze of his *re-*

fined

ſined idea of the marriage inſtitution, an INTRODUCTION preſents itſelf, ſtill farther to engage our good opinion: but, like one of thoſe children, whoſe Jewiſh fathers had married wives of Aſhdod, this *youngſter* mixes the Jews language with a full half of the ſmattering of his Philiſtine mother: with the appearance of candour, he is moſt uncandid.

While he rejects even the beſt *Tranſlation* of the *Bible*, he ſays, the concluſion of the matter ought to be to the LAW and to the TESTIMONY. But, to the moſt, this is as good as no appeal; for he intends only the *original Scriptures:* nor does he ſo much mean *them* neither, as his own ſenſe put upon *them. Nevertheleſs*, we may profit by what that valuable author, Dr. *Leland*, ſays, "It is "the mighty advantage of a written revela- "tion, that, by an impartial conſulting it, the "*deviations from it may be detected*, and things "may be again reduced to the original ſtan- "dard;" and then it will be found that THELYPH has made all this rout to very *little* purpoſe.

He thinks it would be exceeding happy, could we, reformed Proteſtants, clear our-

 ſelves

ſelves of *this* charge in *all reſpects*, that is ſo notoriouſly true of the Papiſts, *viz.* that their fear towards God is taught them by the doctrines and commandments of men; which means, that happy would it be, if Polygamy was allowed by law, and the ſimple *act* of *union* made to conſtitute marriage, without the gags and ſnaffles of betrothing, and making any previous recognition of it. But our Tranſlators, having no real underſtanding and knowledge of this expedite way of making a maid a wife, and being equally ignorant of the bleſſings of Polygamy, are charged with having corrupted the Scriptures, and thereby concealing this part of *Revelation* from the eyes of men, which ought not to be done, for fear of its being *abuſed*. For, ſays THELYPH, "this may be taken as a cer-
"tain rule, that no *abuſe* of the Scriptures
"ever yet happened, from a real underſtand-
"ing and knowledge of their contents, but
"from ignorance, either in ourſelves, or
"impoſed on us by the deſign and arti-
"fice of others *." But, with THELYPH's good leave, beſides his unmeaning diſtinction

* See Preface, p. xxiii.

between

between *ignorance within ourſelves*, and *ignorance impoſed on us*; this certain *rule* is perplexed with a double uncertainty: for, firſt, it is not quite certain, that the Scriptures never were, in any inſtance, knowingly corrupted; nor, ſecondly, is it eaſy to conceive how an abuſe of the Scriptures ſhould happen from *ignorance by deſign* and *artifice*. Hence we ſee, while he aimed to render ſuſpicious, the learning and integrity of thoſe *great* and *conſiderable* men, who tranſlated the ſacred Scriptures of the Old and New Teſtament into our mother dialect, or have been its Expoſitors, he had not the wit to conceal his own weakneſs: we will, therefore, give him back this counterfeit rule, which no mint-maſter of language and conſiſtency will ever let paſs for ſterling, as his own proper wages, for having preſumed to undervalue a ſet of men, who, for the exemplarineſs of their lives, and profound ſkill in the languages, will be for ever deſerving of our higheſt admiration; whilſt we cannot but wonder, that ſuch a *weakneſs* could fall from the pen of ſuch a *wiſe diſcoverer* of both *inherent and impoſed ignorance* in other men.

The SACRED SCRIPTURES, which, by the diligence of moſt godly and learned men, we have tranſlated into our own tongue, ought to be received as the deareſt pledge of God's love and favour to theſe Iſlands, whereby the Britiſh reformed Churches have been edified and made wiſe unto ſalvation: therefore, any attempt made to diſcredit the BIBLE, is an horrid offence againſt the generation of the righteous: it calls for a ſpeedy and effectual antidote; *wherefore*, hear all men, Polygamiſts, hear, and take this as a certain *rule*, that, whereas the Law of the LORD is perfect, and his Judgments true and righteous altogether, every *Author* is guilty of an abuſe of the *Scriptures*, either from the want of a *real underſtanding* and *knowledge* of *their* contents, or elſe from *deſign* and *artifice*, who doth alledge that any doctrine is founded on the baſis of the DIVINE LAW, as the contrivance of INFINITE WISDOM; which, whoſoever practically obſerves, can expect no better reward than what he can fetch out of contention and ſtrife, and every evil work. That theſe evils are the natural attendants on Polygamy, THELYPH, who is conſtantly laying himſelf open to ſtrokes, has not

ſecreted.

ſecreted. "For," ſays he, "the modern "Jews forbid Polygamy among the people, "from the authority of ſome paſſage in the "Talmud *;" and, by the help of a learned Jew, he learned that the reaſons for this prohibition were of the prudential kind: but, were the Talmudiſts and modern Jews more prudent than their ancient Lawgiver? Let us hear what their prudential reaſons are: and, firſt, it ſeems, becauſe of the people in general being too poor to maintain more than one wife; which is as acutely done, as if they had written a precept to proſcribe their poor brethren from keeping a coach and ſervants in livery; or to prohibit any among them, afflicted with blindneſs, from practiſing the art of a limner. And, ſecondly, another prudential reaſon aſſigned, why the Talmudiſts forbid Polygamy, is, becauſe of the quarrels it occaſioned: this witneſs is true, and proves my aſſertion; but if any one ſhould think otherwiſe, let him remember, that, under the goſpel diſpenſation eſpecially, God hath called us unto peace, 1 Cor,

* See the note, p. 279.

vii. Now, Sir, I cannot help expreſſing the higheſt ſatisfaction, in finding that the learned, judicious, and excellent TRANSLATORS of the BIBLE have not ſo rendered any one text either in the *Old* or *New* Teſtament, as to give it the leaſt tendency to lead us into any contention or ſtrife; but whoever beſt obeys the precepts of God's word, as our Bible directs, will ſtand the moſt remote from quarrels; will make the beſt huſband, the beſt father, the beſt neighbour, and the moſt righteous and perfect man. Therefore we may juſtly account of THELYPH as a ſmall and inconſiderable perſon, compared with theſe conſiderable and great men, who maintained a conſtant and wakeful diligence in their tranſlation of the Bible, while THELYPH appears, in this performance, not only comparatively ſmall and inconſiderable, but alſo inconſiderate and drowſy; how elſe could he ſleep over the circumſtance of Jacob's taking Leah and Rachel *, in a point too, that we may ſuppoſe would have been peculiarly

* See note, p. 145.

grateful

grateful to him, had he been awake; for, whoever reads the paſſage, will find but little reaſon to doubt, that not the *half* only, but *all* the twelve ſons of Jacob were born equally under Polygamy, Gen. xxix. 21, to the end. And indeed, not *this* only, but the main ſcope of his writing, has more in it of the wildneſs of a dream, than of the wiſe and wakeful conſideration of a learned head.

I am, *&c.*

LETTER IV.

DEAR SIR,

AS we have ſeen, THELYPH durſt not venture his cauſe upon the impartial judgment of his readers, without adverti-ſing a *laudatory* thereon, and, again and again, aiming to anticipate, by foreſtalling the Reader's *verdict*, we have the more reaſon to ſuſpect, that the whole of the evidence on both ſides, is not faithfully laid open *without diſguiſe*, but with that prejudiced partiality and miſrepreſentation which an honeſt cauſe can never ſtand in need of; or what means all that fume and vapour, which on every occaſion is raiſed out of the dung-hill of Popery? We are content, THELYPH, that you ſhould expoſe the various and jangling opinions of the councils; we allow you to contemn the mighty Polyphem of antiquity, and bind him cloſe with one general accuſation of falſehood; as we chooſe to keep

our

our noſes unbloody and free from bruiſes, though you ſhould burſt your ſides with laughter at the Talpean Phariſaical auſterity, we ſhall not be offended; and we would wiſh you to put the Adamites out of countenance. But, though ſome have even reprobated marriage itſelf, does this or any other error prove the lawfulneſs of breaking all peaceful converſation in the family, or make it godly for a man to live a contentious and unchriſtian life, if his luſtful appetite will not be content without variety: ſurely, every man in his ſober ſenſes muſt rather apprehend that this oppoſite extreme is equally wide from the *truth*. But now, happily, THELYPH is awake, and demands our attention: "A "tree," ſays he, "is not to be deſtroyed by "plucking off a few leaves, or by cutting "away here and there a branch; the ax muſt "be laid to the root: Magdalenes and A-"ſylums are inadequate to empty our *brothels* "that are filled with harlots, and cleanſe our "ſtreets from proſtitutes:" but what does he propoſe as an adequate remedy? Alas! he's gone again; for, contrary to the divine wiſdom, that hateth robbery for a burnt-offering, he would defraud and diſtract the honeſt wife,

and confound all houſhold peace and love, by making every houſe a Magdalene or an Aſylum, to feed the lewdneſs of any enticed, or oftner, if Polygamy was allowed, any enticing whore. But if the laws of heaven were regarded as they ought to be, both by women and men, then *Juſtice* and the *Golden Age* would ſoon return, while the former would be as poſitive to reſiſt and reſent any enticement to unchaſtity, as the latter would abhor the thought of being guilty of ſo much baſeneſs; for, by "having had the doctrine "of holy Scripture with timely care infuſed, "wherein are unfolded thoſe chaſte and high "myſteries, that the body is for the Lord "and the Lord for the body, he will judge, "that if unchaſtity in a woman, whom St. "Paul terms the glory of man, be ſuch a "ſcandal and diſhonour, then certainly in a "man, who is both the image and glory of "God, it muſt, though commonly not ſo "thought, be much more deflowering and "diſhonourable, in that he ſins both againſt "his own body, which is the perfecter ſex, "and his own glory which is in the woman, "and that which is worſt, againſt the image "and glory of God which is in himſelf."

Thus Milton expreſſes himſelf, and I wiſh I could find more of this great man's ſpirit in THELYPHTHORA, who himſelf ſays, " he " did not ſlumber over that *place* expreſſing " ſuch high rewards, of ever accompanying " the Lamb, with thoſe celeſtial ſongs, to " others inapprehenſible, but not to thoſe " who were not *defiled* with women, which " doubtleſs means *fornication:* for *marriage*," ſaith he, " muſt not be called a *defilement*."

The grand queſtion to be tried, therefore, in reality, is, whether THELYPHTHORA is one grand ſophiſm or not? That it is Martin's Hobby is well known: and theſe I take to be his four legs: That marriage is a part of, and belongs to the moral law, I ſhall call the near-foot before: That nothing is eſſential to marriage beſide the one ſingle act of union, is the fore-foot on the off-ſide: The hind-leg on the off-ſide is the chapter on Polygamy, wherein is pleaded its lawfulneſs: And the unlawfulneſs of divorce, the near-leg behind.

The leading ſophiſm of THELYPH is, his making marriage a part of the moral law, which every intelligent Chriſtian muſt allow to be immutable and eternal; that which

which in no caſe can be altered; nor can time ever efface the perpetuity of its obligation. In confidence of this, THELYPH aſks, with an air of ſecurity, "Can any perſon, in "his ſober ſenſes, imagine, that it was un- "lawful in the ſight of God (becauſe ex- "preſsly by a poſitive law forbidden), three "thouſand years ago, to take a virgin and "then abandon her; *but that now it is law-* "*ful?*" In anſwer to which, he muſt be told, That it never was lawful to take a virgin and defile her, though, like Shechem, he ſhould ſpeak ever ſo much to her heart with words of kindneſs, any more than to ſteal an ox or a ſheep *; but, that the precept which ordains, that if a man entice a virgin that is not betrothed, and lie with her, he ſhall ſurely endow her to be his wife, belongs not to the moral law, is evident; becauſe there are other laws, which, in the caſes they ſeverally reſpect, make it unlawful for the ſeducer to take her, or render it impoſſible that he ſhould: as for inſtance, if the ſeducer ſhould be a man of another tribe †; or if he be a Gentile or ſtranger ‡; in neither caſe

* Exod. xxii. † Numb. xxvi. 6–9. ‡ Deut. vii. 3.

could

could ſhe be his wife. If the high prieſt ſhould ſo far depart from the ſanctity of his ſtation and office as to deflower a virgin, he could not afterwards marry her * ; and if the enticed virgin ſhould be a prieſt's daughter, ſo far is the law from ſaying to the ſeducer, he ſhall ſurely endow her to be his wife, that it drags her away from her pretended huſband, by denouncing her to an awful death †. Therefore THELYPH miſtakes egregiouſly, when he ſays the precepts written in Exod. xxii. 16. and Deut. xxii. 24. are as unchangeable as the God that made them, as by theſe four inſtances is clearly evinced: and hence I conclude that theſe precepts belong not to the *moral*, but to the *judicial* or civil law; and if they belong to the civil law, it muſt alſo be concluded, that the enticed virgin no more became the ſeducer's lawful wife becauſe he had lain with her, than the ox or the ſheep was the lawful property of him who had ſtolen them; but as the recompence for an ox was five oxen, and four ſheep for one ſheep ſtolen, ſo the ſeducer is enjoined to recompenſe the enticed virgin, by

* Levit. xxi. 7. † Levit. xxi. 9.

eſpouſing

eſpouſing her to be his wife; and let her prove *everſomuch worſe than he took her for*, becauſe of his ſinful baſeneſs in humbling and defiling her, he may not put her away all his days. Hence, if I miſtake not, on this near-foot before is a ſoreneſs that needs the help of his Farrier.

I am, *&c.*

LET-

LETTER V.

DEAR SIR,

IT was known, long before THELYPH made his appearance, nor does his affirmation add a grain to its weight, that *both ſides of a contradiction cannot be true*; and this is a mighty advantage which we have againſt him. Indeed he has no need of any other adverſary, who is ſo conſtantly his own; for I find this leg is already ſo ſore by his own kicking, that it ſeems almoſt too cruel to touch it. However, in fulfilment of my promiſe, I proceed to conſider this *Palfry*'s notion of marriage as a *divine ordinance*. But though I call all the courts to witneſs, that I have not bribed him to blind his eyes in this matter, yet, in the ardour of his zeal for Polygamy, rather than ſuffer *David* to die monogamous, or with only one wife living, he as poſitively aſſerts, that Abiſhag, the beautiful Shunamite, was David's *wife*, and

and afterwards his *widow*, as in this chapter of marriage he aſſerted before, that the *union* of the man and the woman in *perſonal knowledge* of each other is the *only* marriage ordinance. Sir, with your leave, I will ſpeak to him: Ho! THELYPH, attend! How can you be ſo *dozy* in the midſt of danger? Do not you perceive where you are? Whence can ariſe this ſtupefaction? I fear your roguiſh Farrier hath given you a poppy drench, that made you dream of David's having a wife to whom (you have written a whole chapter to prove it) he was never married. For if it plainly appears, by what Solomon ſaid, that Abiſhag was ſo *betrothed* or *eſpouſed* to David, as to be looked upon to be his *wife*, it as plainly proves, that *perſonal knowledge* is not the *ordinance* of *marriage*; nor could almoſt the laſt act of David's life be an act of *Polygamy*, unleſs this *virgin*, by being *betrothed* or *eſpouſed* by him (as you ſay ſhe was), became thereby, truly and properly, his *wife*, according to the divine *inſtitution* of *marriage*. Thus, Sir, you ſee, poor THELYPH is fallen into the hands of a cruel Lord: no recreant Jew can be more hard-hearted than ſuch a dilemma: it will not ſuffer him to

cleave

cleave to both parts of this contradiction, by a *polygamous* attraction; it will be for ever clamorous, and will allow him the only privilege of chuſing which he will part with. Say, THELYPH, will you give up your *only* ordinance of marriage, or will you unſay, that almoſt the laſt act of David's life was an act of Polygamy, and again take from him the *wife*, which in your zeal you gave him?

Though THELYPH's way of arguing is often ſubtile and very plauſible, ſpeaking alſo generally with a confidence equal to any, *even* of the inſpired Prophets, yet we are not (you ſee) to ſeek for a rule whereby to judge of him: and we doubt not but Truth the ſtrong, watching its advantages, will be able to detect Error the weak, and put it to the rout, though it be ever ſo *ſly* and *ſhifting*. Firſt, then, it is evident, that the joining of the man and woman in *perſonal knowledge* of each other, is *not* that *union* which conſtitutes marriage, from what Adam ſaid, Gen. ii. 23, 24. *This is* now bone *of my* bones, *and fleſh of my fleſh*; and this Adam announced *immediately* upon his receiving *Eve* from the hands of her Maker: "*now*," ſays he, be-

fore he *knew her*. That this relation of the firſt pair to each other was *conjugal*, muſt be concluded, becauſe otherwiſe the words want *truth* and *accuracy*: for thus it is written, *The Lord God cauſed a deep ſleep to fall upon Adam, and* HE *took one of his* ribs, *and of* the rib *made* HE *a woman, and brought her to the* man; *and Adam ſaid, This is* NOW bone *of my* bones, *and* fleſh *of my* fleſh; which, it is ſufficiently clear, was ſpoken by him in a *conjugal* ſenſe, as ſhe ſtood to him in the relation of a *wife*, as appears from the general inference which immediately follows, *Therefore ſhall* a man *leave his father and mother, and ſhall cleave unto his* wife, *and* they ſhall be one fleſh. Therefore, THELYPH, *I cannot but think that there is ſome weighty reaſon why Adam, on receiving Eve from the hands of her* Creator *to be his wife, uſed a difference of expreſſion*, not ſpeaking *literally* the matter of fact, and thereby *reſtricting* it to his own *perſon*, as *ſhe* was taken out of *himſelf*; but he expreſſeth the matter *conjugally*, and at *large*; ſo that if it belongeth not *properly* to every human pair that ſhould after enter into the ſame relation to each other, it was ſpoken of himſelf with as little *propriety*; for, *Eve*, in her conſtitu-

ent

ent parts, as compoſed of *fleſh* and *bones*, was created from one *bone only*, and not of Adam's *fleſh*, nor had he *known her*, when, with an inſpired mouth he ſaid, *This is* now fleſh *of my* fleſh.

Secondly, that the joining of the *man* and *woman*, in *perſonal knowledge* of each other, is not that *union* which conſtitutes marriage, is farther evident from the Apoſtle's reaſoning, 1 Cor. vi. 15, 16. *Know ye not*, ſays he, *that your bodies are the members of Chriſt? Shall I then take the members of Chriſt, and make them the members of an harlot? What, know ye not, that he that is joined to an harlot is one body? For two, ſaith Jehovah, ſhall be one fleſh.* From which paſſage nothing can be clearer, than that the mere being one *body* and one *fleſh*, by a carnal and trothleſs copulation, is not *marriage*. Therefore *marriage*, as the inſtitution of God, muſt needs conſiſt, as to the eſſence of it, in ſomething which is becoming the dignity and pre-eminence of his rational creatures, as the ſubjects of his moral government; and which diſtinguiſheth the ſame act into either *lawful* and *pure*, or *unlawful* and *defiling*. What then, is it the action itſelf that hallows this intercourſe be-

tween the married pair? that cannot be; for without all contradiction, the *leſs* is bleſſed of the *better:* now conſider how great this inſtitution of *marriage* is, that makes the ſame action between the married pair *pure* and *undefiled*; when as, wherever this joining into one *body* and one *fleſh* ſhould come to paſs, between *two* independent or unmarried perſons, it is no other than a *malignant* and *odious* whoredom.

THELYPH alſo appears to be miſtaken in his *fleſhly* notion of what he calls the only ordinance of marriage, in another point of view, if the judgment of that man, whom he calls the great Milton, is worthy of acceptation; who eſteems carnal knowledge, which he calls the ſenſitive pleaſing of the body, to be but the *ſubordinate*, and not ſo much as the *chiefeſt* end of marriage, much leſs marriage itſelf: "For carnal knowledge," ſays he, "may join thoſe perſons together, that law "and nature *dare* not join: but what the "chiefeſt end was of God's creating woman to "be joined to man, his own inſtituting words "declare, and are infallible to inform us what "is marriage, and what is no marriage; *it is* "*not good* (ſaith HE), that man ſhould be "alone,

" alone, *I will make him a help meet for him*;
" from which words, ſo plain (ſays Milton),
" leſs cannot be concluded, nor is, by any
" learned interpreter, than that, in God's in-
" tention, a meet and happy converſation is
" the *chiefeſt* and *nobleſt* end of marriage:
" for we find here no expreſſion ſo neceſſarily
" implying carnal knowledge, as this preven-
" tion of lonelineſs to the mind and ſpirit of
" man. And indeed (ſays he), it is a greater
" bleſſing from God, more worthy ſo excel-
" lent a creature as man is, and a higher end
" to honour and ſanctify the *league of mar-*
" *riage*, when as the ſolace and ſatisfaction of
" the mind is regarded and provided for, be-
" fore the ſenſitive pleaſing of the body."
And again, ſays he, " Marriage, by the na-
" tural and plain order of God's inſtitution in
" the text, may be more demonſtratively and
" eſſentially defined to be, *a divine inſtitution*,
" *joining man and woman, in a love fitly diſ-*
" *poſed to the helps and comforts of domeſtic*
" *life*; but, *one fleſh* (or the mere union of
" male and female in perſonal knowledge of
" each other) is not the formal eſſence of
" wedlock; elſe (ſays he) many aged and
" holy matrimonies, and more eminently

" that of JOSEPH and MARY, would be " no true marriage." And THELYPH, who, like Nebuchadnezzar, had perhaps forgot what he had been dreaming about the only marriage ordinance in this firſt chapter, in chap. iii. on Adultery, ſays as much himſelf. And, leſt it ſhould eſcape our notice, to do us the greater pleaſure, has ſcored it down in capitals. " So ſtrict (ſays he) is this " law, with regard to adultery, that it even " reaches to the defilement of a betrothed wo- " man, who, in God's ſight, is reckoned as " the man's wife to whom ſhe is betrothed." In proof of this, he quotes Deut. xxii. 23, 24. " *If a damſel that is a virgin be* BE- " TROTHED *unto an* HUSBAND, *and a man* " *find her in the city, and lie with her, then* " *ſhall ye bring them both into the gate of that* " *city, and ye ſhall ſtone them with ſtones that* " *they die: the damſel, becauſe ſhe cried not,* " *being in the city; and the man, becauſe* " *he* HATH HUMBLED HIS NEIGHBOUR'S " WIFE." Now, alas, THELYPH! where does this reach to? farther, I dare ſay, than you intended it ſhould: can this be reckoned any other than a poſitive contradiction to your deſcription of marriage? If carnal know-

knowledge is neceſſary to conſtitute a marriage, and nothing elſe is of divine inſtitution, how came you to be ſo unwary as to ſuffer this text to ſtand whole againſt you? Surely you could not, if awake, conſider it as only a lifeleſs Coloſſus, or a carved giant, that lifts its club, but ſtrikes not. According to your wonted ſkill, you might have ſhewn us how far the Tranſlators had gone in corrupting the text; or if their verſion is unimpeachable, might not ſome miſtake have ſlipt from the pen of Moſes; or the whole paſſage have been ſurreptitiouſly introduced?

But theſe hints will not do now:- matters are gone too far to be recalled; for you have publicly recognized it for a Scripture truth, "that if a man ſhould find a *virgin* that is "*betrothed* unto an *huſband*, and *lie with her*, "he hath DEFILED HIS NEIGHBOUR'S "WIFE;" which proves againſt you, that the being *eſpouſed* unto an *huſband* contains in it the *eſſence* of marriage; and certain it is, that whatever conſtitutes marriage, is the *quality* that ſanctifies and makes lawful the man and woman's coming together, in the mutual *benevolence* of matrimonial duties: for, if carnal knowledge is eſſential to marriage, and

nothing elſe, this text is not a law againſt adultery, but againſt marriage; an unrighteous and cruel adjudging the man and woman to death, not for a real, but a conſtructive adultery, forced upon the only ordinance paſſing between them, according to the primary inſtitution. Surely THELYPH will not ſay the man deſerved death as an adulterer, only for taking the advantage of his procraſtinating neighbour; much leſs, that the virgin ſhould alſo die *for giving her perſon to the man of her* lateſt *choice.*

Thus, Sir, you ſee THELYPH is caught again in the toils of his own laying. Who that paſſes by can forbear to ſtretch out the hand and ſay, "Ah, Miſer! *quanta labo-*
" *ras in Charybde;* forbear your fruitleſs la-
" bour; your carnal ligament of marriage
" can never be ſcrewed up to ſound uniſon
" with this heaven-preſcribed precept of
" Moſes."

I remain, with perpetual regard,

Dear Sir,

Yours, &c.

LETTER VI.

DEAR SIR,

MARRIAGE, ſaith the Apoſtle St. Paul, *is honourable in all, and the bed undefiled:* then, certainly, marriage is one thing, and the mutual benevolence of the marriage-bed is another. This diſtinction is neceſſary to ſecure the elegance and propriety of the Apoſtle's language, which is no inconſiderable evidence of the falſity of THELYPH's definition; which indeed is not a definition, but a bold aſſertion, from premiſes that cannot ſupport his opinion. "When the great and "all-wiſe Creator had formed man upon the "earth, male and female, *he bleſſed them*, "*and ſaid unto them, Be fruitful and multiply*, "*and repleniſh the earth*, Gen. i. 28. the "*means* ordained for this purpoſe (ſays he), "is the only marriage-ordinance." And in a ſomewhat ſimilar manner he introduces his ſecond chapter on *Whoredom* and *Fornication:* "When GOD, the CREATOR and LORD of "all,

" all, was pleaſed to ordain the *means* by " which his creatures were to *increaſe and* " *multiply, and repleniſh the earth*, in which " primary command, his *reaſonable* creatures " were *equally* intereſted with the brute part " of the creation." *Equally intereſted!* who can but admire this *maſculine* Writer's elevation of thought? But, though this primary command was *particularly* addreſſed to the human pair, Gen. i. 28. yet, unhappily for THELYPH, it was *firſt* addreſſed to the great whales, and every living creature that moveth, which the waters brought forth abundantly after their kind, and every winged fowl after his kind, Gen. i. 21, 22. before *man* was created, *And God bleſſed them, ſaying, Be fruitful, and multiply, and fill the waters in the ſeas, and let fowl multiply in the earth.* If, therefore, the procreative means ordained for the increaſe and multiplying of the creatures, is the only ordinance of marriage, it was inſtituted before the human pair were created; and ſome of the creatures have not only an *equal*, but a *prior* right in this inſtitution: and thence it muſt follow, that the engendering of the whales of the ſea, as alſo, the conſorting of the fowls of the air, is, in this

this reſpect, as truly *marriage*, according to the primary command, *Increaſe and multiply*. But, though what has been ſaid already ſhould ſeem ſufficient to overthrow THELYPH's carnal notion, that the inſtitution of marriage conſiſteth in *nothing* but what is common to a *man* and a *man-tyger*, a *whale* and a *ſparrow*, a *mouſe*, or an *Elephant*; I cannot help adverting to a paſſage which THELYPH ſeems to have not only employed all the *intrigue* he is maſter of, but alſo ſome force to engage on his ſide, though with ill ſucceſs, as you ſhall ſee, without long ſtaying for: the paſſage I mean, is Exod. xxii. 16, 17. *If a man entice a maid that is not betrothed, and lie with her, he ſhall ſurely endow her* to be *his* wife. *If her father utterly refuſe to give her unto him, he ſhall pay money according to the dowry of virgins.* "By "this paſſage (ſays THELYPH), as from "many others in the ſacred Scriptures, it "appears, that fathers, during the minority "of their daughters, as in every other in-"ſtance (ſee Numb. xxx. 3, 4, 5.), ſo, in the "buſineſs of contracting marriage, had a ne-"gative in their own power." Now, Sir, this honour and privilege due to the father, is

no ſooner aſſerted, than it is by him again diſſolved: like as a vicious cow, when ſhe has yielded a good pail of milk, ſtraightway ſets her foot into it, and kicks it down again. Or rather, he has ſerved the poor father as Hanun did David's ſervants, who took them and ſhaved off one half of their beards, and cut off their garments in the middle, even to their buttocks, and ſent them away diſfigured and aſhamed to Jericho. For, in vain does he ſay, if I am a father, where is mine honour, when Tom, or Will, or Arthur, may inſultingly reply: "Your honour, Sir—are you a father in Iſrael, and yet to learn what conſtitutes marriage: Surely you cannot conceive that your *conſent* is *eſſential:*" to which the father replies, "Sirrah, I have counſel's opinion before me *, who ſays, the father has a negative in his own power, and if the father with-holds his conſent, neither the betrothing, nor eſpouſals, nor any contract ariſing from them, can be carried into execution." "Pſhaw! quoth Tom, a very ignorant and ſilly opinion indeed, if your counſellor and you knew no better, I did, and

* See Thelyphthora, p. 25.

therefore

therefore have married your daughter, according to the primary inſtitution, without abuſing it with pre-contracts, or any other ſuperſtitious ceremonies; nay, frown not, nor miſtake me for a fool; matters are gone too far to be recalled; and, by the opinion of a counſellor quite as learned as yours, I am inſtructed, that the ſimple act of union has made us indiſſolubly one fleſh *; wherefore, by this primary inſtitution, your honour and your negative power are both thrown into the ſuds together." Hence, will it not be thought that THELYPH has been taking fees on both ſides? But, however that may be, it is plain that the boaſted prerogative of parental authority, in the buſineſs of contracting marriage, and thereby diſpoſing of their children, is not worth a ruſh, in thoſe caſes where it is moſt needed; as it is always in the power of the children to *preclude* the father's conſent whenever they pleaſe; and, which is the conſequence of THELYPH's ſlip-ſkin contrivance, with his ſophiſtical bolting-hatch, to ſift fornication into marriage.

* See Thelyphthora's Definition of Marriage, p. 18.

But,

But, my young maſter, the divine Hiſtorian and Lawgiver was not miſtaken when he ſaid, *The people began to commit* whoredom *with the daughters of Moab*, Numb. xxv. 1. and, though I do not juſtify the deceit of Jacob's ſons, and the ſlaughter that enſued, yet they very well underſtood the nature of Shechem's *commerce* with their ſiſter Dinah, Gen. xxxiv. 31. which is a true key to open the nature of what is ſuppoſed to happen in this text. But, though I have determined not to bribe him with even the *ſeventh* part of a *ſhekel*, THELYPH will not ſuffer us to want the ſanction of his evidence to confirm the point I am contending for, ſee note, p. 28. "This "text, Exod. xxii. 16. (ſays he), ſpeaks of "ſuch as did *entice a maid* with promiſe of "marriage, and then DEFILED her, as that, "Deut. xxii. 28. of DEFILING a maid, that "being occaſionally laid hold of, did pre-"ſently yield." Therefore, as he acknowledges, that, in both paſſages, the maid is DEFILED, it muſt be concluded, againſt him, that this means the *defilement* of *fornication* or *whoredom*; *for* marriage (ſays the Apoſtle) *is honourable, and the bed* UNDEFILED. And

ſo

ſo it is very true, that Exod. xxii. 17. doth not ſay, "If the *father utterly refuſe to give her unto him*, ſuch *marriage* ſhall be *null* and *void*, becauſe neither the 16th verſe, nor any other text in the ſacred Scriptures, alloweth the reducing and terminating of luſt between ſuch cattle to be marriage;" and as little doth the text ſay, "Though the father utterly refuſe to give her unto him, ſuch refuſal ſhall be *null* and *void*, he ſhall ſurely give his *conſent*:" and leaſt of all does it ſuggeſt this childiſh conceit, "That the man ſhould *endow his wife to be his wife* (BY paying the dower), after marriage." Once more, THELYPH having acknowledged, that where a man and a virgin are united to each other, *only* by the mere communication of their perſons, the virgin is defiled thereby; and it is proved from St. Paul, that what *defileth* is not *marriage*, and if not *marriage*, it muſt be *fornication*, and if *fornication*, it follows, that they are not ſo *indiſſolubly united*, but the father in *refuſing* may *refuſe* to give his daughter to her *ſeducer*. This law does not in any inſtance give room for the man to take advantage of his own wrong; the law is not on the ſide of the culprit, to reward him for the wrong

wrong he has done; the father has the law on his ſide, and at his option; the culprit ſhall either eſpouſe the damſel to him for his wife, or pay money according to the dowry of the virgin. And it affords me no ſmall pleaſure, Sir, that I can congratulate you on the good father's appearing again at the head of his family with honour, having his beard grown, and clothed anew, after THELYPH's having played him ſuch an *Ammoniti∫h trick*; and eſpecially, as hereby *his* ſwiniſh notion of marriage is (like another painted Jezebel) thrown out of the window to the dogs.

"Now, truſt me readers," ſays the great Milton of an opponent of his, "if I be not "already weary of pluming and footing this "ſea-gull, ſo open he lies to ſtrokes." The ſame may be ſaid of THELYPH, who trots on, without ſeeing the blunders, abſurdities, and impoſſibilities that ſtare him full in his eyes: we have a proof of this in the following curious tranſition: "Having ſeen what was to "be done where a man enticed a maid, and "took actual poſſeſſion of her *againſt* the fa-"ther's *conſent*; let us (ſays he) next ſee "what was to be done when a man took a "maid without *even* the father's *knowledge*."

Surely

Surely in vain is the net ſpread in the ſight of any bird, Prov. i. 17. THELYPH therefore muſt think that all his readers are ſtruck with a worſe than Talpæan blindneſs, if he imagines they could paſs over this, without obſerving him deficient either in knowledge or integrity. I promiſe him a whole peck of *oats*, and a half quartern of *beans* into the bargain, if he can prove that Exod. xxii. 16, 17. affords the leaſt foundation to ſuppoſe that the father had any more *knowledge* of his daughter's being *enticed* and *defiled*, or that it was intended before the commiſſion of the fact, than in the latter caſe ſuppoſed in Deut. xxii. 28, 29. It is too abſurd to ſuppoſe the father an acceſſary againſt his conſent, or, indeed, that he would tamely ſtand by, and ſee his daughter enticed and defiled before his face. But, whether the man firſt took the father, and bound him to a tree or a poſt, and then took *actual* poſſeſſion of the maid *with his knowledge, againſt his conſent*, THELYPH has not yet explained; though, doubtleſs, he might do this with as much hope to be credited as when he aſſerts, that though the father utterly refuſe to give her to him, he ſhall pay money according to the dowry of vir-

gins, is *but explanatory* of what goes before, he *ſhall ſurely endow her to be his wife*, BY paying the dower into the hands of the father *after the marriage:* and therefore, the words, *if*, or *though the father utterly refuſe to give her unto him*, are utterly void of any force or ſignification whatſoever; which is not more credible, than if he had interpreted, *utterly to refuſe*, to mean the *father's joy* and *ready conſent* to the marriage. Nay, Sir, would you think it, though he ſo poſitively calls that marriage, when the man had not only enticed the maid, but had actually lain with her; "for (ſays he) now the primary inſti-"tution took place," p. 25. yet, in the note, p. 226. he allows that the word tranſlated *fornication*, may ſignify *lewdneſs committed before marriage*, but not found out till afterwards; which, while it confirms the plain unſophiſticated meaning of theſe texts, leaves him *convicted* as an *abſurd* inconſiſtent Writer; and I leave him to conſider whether he chuſe it ſhall be imputed to his *artifice* or *want of underſtanding*.

I am, *&c.*

LETTER VII.

DEAR SIR,

WHEN Joſhua, by divine command, *houghed* the horſes of that combined hoſt which he overthrew by the waters of Merom, perhaps he might feel ſome pity for the anguiſh of the poor beaſts, even while he was triumphing in the deſtruction of his adverſaries: but though I may not *balk* his *heels*, I hope I may be allowed to feel a little for poor THELYPH, who has been too unmercifully ſpurred on to an attack on the *preſent ſyſtem of things with regard to marriage*, without any foreſight at all as to the conſequences. For, like that Jeſuit, who was was SO pious, and SO avoided the ſight of all women, that he would not even ſee his own mother *; in like manner, THELYPH has SO defined the *marriage-ordinance*, and SO avoided the ſin of fornication, that, though he ſhould now become as quick-ſighted as any fennel-rubbed

* P. 125. See the note.

ſerpent, as the great Milton phraſes it, he will never, according to his *ſyſtem*, be able to point out a ſingle inſtance of *fornication* or *whoredom* as a crime *diſtinct* from *adultery*: which, if there was nothing elſe, is, of itſelf, ſufficient to prove THELYPH's notion of what conſtitutes marriage, an *unſcriptural fallacy*. To little purpoſe, then, has he ſerved two apprenticeſhips or more, in turning over *Dictionaries* and *Lexicons*, in queſt of a literal variation or two in our tranſlation of the Old Teſtament from the original Hebrew: for, if he had even added more reading than he appears to have, and had waded up to his chin in the volume of antiquity, it has left him ſhallow enough in wiſdom; for with all his alchymy, he has produced nothing better than a pargeted catholicon, ſent forth as a certain remedy againſt fornication and whoredom, but with no other effect than to *rankle* and *inflame* it, with the complication of a ſtill more defiling adultery. "For (ſays "he), if a man entice a virgin, or lay hold on "her, and lie with her, this is the ordinance "of marriage, the only one ever ordain-"ed." The conſequence of which is, every virgin muſt be properly, and always, the wife

wife of the firſt man with whom ſhe cohabits; and every carnal connection which ſhe may have with another man, muſt be adultery, ſo long as her huſband liveth; but when her huſband is dead, ſhe is looſed from the law of her huſband; and then, her next act of lewdneſs, I beg THELYPH's pardon for calling it lewdneſs, for, in his ſyſtem, it is neither whoredom nor lewdneſs, but the ordinance of marriage, whereby ſhe is once more become a wife, and her old courſe again becomes adultery. But, ſuppoſe her huſband ſhould put her away by a lawful divorce, then certainly ſhe is no longer his wife; and if not his wife, ſhe's free; and if free, ſhe is at liberty to marry again; that is, ſhe may in her turn entice the firſt man ſhe meets, married or ſingle, it is all one with THELYPH; and this firſt connection is the ordinance of marriage, by which ſhe again obtains a huſband; and again, all the lewdneſs that follows is ſtamped with the ſin of adultery as before; and ſo it will ever be, as long as the *one ſimple act of union* is the only ordinance of marriage. And now, my dear friend, THELYPH may go lament his ſelf-

defeated ſcheme, whilſt, with a voice audible enough, we hear his firſt chapter of MARRIAGE *as a divine inſtitution*, accuſing his ſecond, of WHOREDOM *and* FORNICATION, as an impertinent intruding ſoleciſm; wherein he has undertaken the hard and adventurous taſk, to define a non-entity, by deſcribing the properties of a crime, that, on his ſyſtem, never was nor can be committed. But, to put the finiſhing ſtroke to this ſubject, I ſhall only obſerve farther, that, in chap. i. p. 44. he ſays, "the taking the woman and laying with her, "moſt clearly appears to make her the man's "wife;" but, in chap. ii. p. 50. that he may be explicit, and ſurely we need not wiſh him to lay himſelf more open, he ſays, "A "woman's giving her perſon to a man, with-"out any intent of marriage, is whoredom; "—and if a virgin gave her perſon to *one* "*man*, and afterwards went to another, "though for the purpoſe of marriage with "the ſecond"—what then? does it not moſt clearly appear that ſhe is the firſt man's wife? if ſo, ſhe is an adultereſs, by going to the ſecond *:

* And ſuch he pronounces her to be, vol. ii. p. 175.

"but,

" but, as THELYPH here affirms, ſhe only
" ſtamped whoredom on this occaſion, it
" moſt clearly appears that ſhe was not
" lawfully married to either." And now, Sir, I cannot help expreſſing the higheſt ſatisfaction and joy, that THELYPH has not been betrayed into this literary pin-fold, by any of our learned commentators or ſpiritual expoſitors; nor was he led into it by any of the tranſlations, whether Latin, French, or Engliſh, which are all ſufficiently exact to inſtruct the ſincere Chriſtian in his way to heaven; but this has he purchaſed to himſelf, for his wildly ſtraying into devious paths, not accompanying thoſe evangelical and learned men, who have followed one another, like the true ſheep of Chriſt, in the ſame,—the only track that leads to paſtures ever-green, beneath the ſunny influence of bright conſiſtent truth. Thus, Sir, having finiſhed what I purpoſed to ſay on THELYPH's only marriage-ordinance, I leave him to the ſkill and care of his farrier; let him apply his charge—his balſams and ointments; and if he can cement and cicatrize theſe wide and gaping contradictions into a ſound and health-

ful union, I ſhall eſteem it to be a greater miracle than that wrought by the *mark* or *ſediment* of the celebrated *Beaume de Vie*; of which it is affirmed, that it cured a poor labouring man's broken rib within twenty-four hours from the accident, being mixed up with hog's lard, and laid over the place.

I remain, *&c.*

LETTER VIII.

DEAR SIR,

WHEN I had wrote my laſt letter, I did not ſuppoſe I ſhould have had occaſion to ſay any thing more with reſpect to THELYPH's carnal and unſcriptural notion of marriage; but as he has again expoſed himſelf, by the publication of a Third Volume, two hundred and fifty pages of which are truly, as he calls them, a dry and barren deſert, over which I ſuppoſe few will chuſe to travel a ſecond journey; where not a blade of graſs, or one flowery ſhrub, is to be found; it is a pity he did not adhere to the great Milton's advice, and let Du-Pin reſt upon his ſhelf, and ſtring him hard, leſt the various and jangling opinions of fathers, Popes, councils, and popiſh doctors, ſhould put all his leaves into a flutter: for ſurely, thoſe pious miniſters of the goſpel who have done THELYPHTHORA the *honour* of publicly preaching againſt it, or any beſide, can never be convinced, by this

cart-

cart-load of *Samaritan trumpery*, that *he* is the only infallible interpreter of Scripture; and by conſequence, that there is but one only *inſtitution* of *marriage* for man, made in the image of God, the beaſts of the foreſt, and the monſters of the ſea; or that Polygamy among Chriſtians is *holy*, *harmleſs*, and *undefiled*. Therefore we will attend him a little farther; and firſt, by way of memorandum, we have the *third* time inſerted, *the grand queſtion to be tried*. THELYPH complains, "that partial "quotations of his *work* have been made and "cenſured, and the *queſtion* itſelf kept en-"tirely out of ſight;" but this looks like affectation; for, in truth, he has taken no more care of his queſtion than an oſtrich does of her eggs: it is no wonder that it has been neglected, becauſe it is no part of the controverſy; or perhaps it may be a golden egg deceitfully offered as a douceur wherewith to bias the judgment of the reader, who was to conſider himſelf as impannelled on the *jury*; however, this is certain, that the *evidence* on which it was to be determined, is *itſelf* the *grand queſtion* which is on *trial*. But my preſent buſineſs is to bring on another *queſtion* for *trial*, reſpecting THELYPH's right of *com-*

mon,

mon, *i. e.* whether I have pounded him juſtly or not. His plea is, "That it is a *miſtake* "which many have fallen into, that, on his "*principle*, there can be no ſuch thing as *for*-"*nication* or *whoredom*, as a crime *diſtinct* "from *adultery* *." He repeats it, "That "the intercourſe of a *virgin* with a *man* con-"ſtitutes a *marriage* in the ſight of God, "becauſe it is written, *They ſhall be one fleſh*;" which, for argument's ſake, was granted him; but, to evade the conſequence, he ſays farther †, "That if this *woman* departs from this "*firſt man* to *another*, the *bond* with the *firſt* "is totally vacated by her *act* of *adultery*." But THELYPH muſt remain in his *literary* durance until he has ſolved a few *difficulties*. As firſt, if the *act* of *adultery* extinguiſhes the relation itſelf of *matrimony*, they are then no longer *man* and *wife*, ſhe is become a *ſingle woman*; and, if I miſtake not, he cannot conſiſtently deny but it is lawful for any *ſingle* perſon to *marry*; then he muſt croſs his own principle, if he denies that her next connection is any other than a good and lawful marriage. But ſecondly, if by an *act* of *adul*-

* Thel. vol. iii. p. 398. † Ibid. p. 396.

tery

tery the *bond* of matrimony is *totally* vacated, under what predicament is the huſband, when, after this act ſecretly committed, the woman doth not forſake his bed?—Is his future benevolence fornication, or a renewal of the marriage; or is it ſome new thing on the earth, which yet waiteth for our Thelyphthorian Adam to give a name to? Or, ſuppoſe this thing ſhould be known to the huſband, and he is pleaſed to forgive her infidelity, is ſhe his wife? or, is it no better than an agreement to live together in fornication? For remember, you ſay, THELYPH, "That "the bond is totally vacated by her *act* of "adultery." Therefore, once more, to what purpoſe is the permiſſion of divorce granted to the huſband? To whom muſt he give his his *libellum excidii*, or *bill of cutting off?* Not to his *wife*; for, being aſſiſted and tutored by THELYPH, ſhe has ſtole a march upon him, and the relation of huſband and wife, according to him, is totally extinguiſhed by her *act*. This, ſhould his whole ſcheme be adopted together, might be adverti ſed as a moſt eaſy and pleaſant method of freeing a diſcontented couple, to the liberty of a ſecond choice. But THELYPH's own comment is here

here ſufficiently deciſive; vol. II. p. 4. note, he ſays, "the word *apoluo*, ſignifies to ſet "looſe, or to releaſe as from a *bond*, and ſo "to divorce a *wife* by looſing the bond of "marriage, and this (ſaith he) was in the "huſband's own power." Bravo, THELYPH! then it was not in the wife's own power; but if not, ſhe muſt remain, as before, a wife, after her act of adultery, and conſequently the bond of marriage is not vacated by that act; and hereby only can the huſband retain his juſt authority, and the freedom of his own will, whether to uſe the lawful privilege of divorce, or to forgive the injury on any conditions he pleaſes; ſuppoſe, on her promiſe of future fidelity: from whence alſo may be concluded, that marriage is a more rational and human covenant than what concerns *equally* the increaſing of the breed of *beagles*, *tarriers*, *grey-hounds*, *fox-hounds* and *foxes ſetting-dogs*, *pointers*, or even *partridges*, *pheaſants*, or *wood-cocks*. Therefore THELYPH's incongruities of *union* and *diſunion* of *men* and *women* by the fleſh only, may go and yoke together, until infancy and ſlumber ſhall invent ſomething more childiſh and unworthy of the rational nature of man.

"What

" What a *ſtupidneſs* is it (ſays Milton), that in " marriage, which is the neareſt reſemblance " of our union to Chriſt, we ſhould deject " ourſelves to ſuch a *ſluggiſh* and *underfoot* " philoſophy, as to eſteem the validity of " marriage *merely* by the *fleſh!* as well (ſays " he) might we attempt to weave a garment " of dry ſand:" our concluſion therefore is ſolid, and remains unſhaken; and THELYPH muſt remain, as is uſual for other *ſtrays*, until his maſter ſhall pay the fees, and take him home.

But, once more, THELYPH bids his readers " try what can be made of the maid " that is not betrothed, Exod. xxii. 16. and " of the damſel, Deut. xxii. 28. are theſe " ſtigmatized as whores," ſays he? Yes, they are, firſt, by the verdict of the ſons of Iſrael in the caſe of their ſiſter Dinah; and again plainly aſſerted in Deut. xxii. 21. alſo Levit. xxi. 9. and Numb. xxv. 1. and by THELYPHTHORA, in vol. I. p. 28. note, (firſt edition); where he ſpeaks of them both as defiled; " which (ſays Milton) muſt mean " fornication, for marriage may not be called " a defilement;" and in ſo ſaying, he is fully juſtified by the Apoſtle, Heb. xiii. 4. But

let

let us now ſee what THELYPH has made of theſe texts himſelf; ſure it is, his ſentiments reflect but little honour on the language of them; indeed it makes them ſpeak in ſuch a fallen ſtyle, as is utterly unworthy of the perſpicuity and majeſty of the Scriptures. Who would have thought, if THELYPH had not ſo explained it, that Moſes meant to ſay, "if a man ſhould *marry* a maid, he ſhall ſurely *marry* her, and ſhe ſhall be his *wife*, becauſe he hath *married* her:" certainly he deſerves, for this, no leſs honour than thoſe *great authorities* that compoſed the councils of ARLES and NEO-CÆSAREA; and if he will ſet BRAVO-BRAVI TUTTI to a new tune, no doubt but the old woman that ſells apples at the corner of Crooked-lane, *Canon*-ſtreet, will join the chorus.

I obſerve, that THELYPH would not be thought to diſparage, or to diſpute the neceſſity of marriage-ceremony; but by comparing his different aſſertions on this part of his ſubject, it looks as if he *wiſhed* and *aimed* to be the leaſt in the kingdom of heaven. "For "(ſays he) we find no marriage-ceremony ſo "much as mentioned in the Scriptures—Mo-"ſes left no direction about it—it is no more

" eſſential to the life of marriage, than the " burial-ſervice is to the death of a dead " corpſe.—The Lawgiver of Iſrael left the " buſineſs of marriage, as at firſt ordained, " to the one ſimple *act* of union." Theſe ſentiments are found in vol. I. p. 23, 24. (firſt edition).—But vol. II. p. 70. 72. he ſays, " That, in this corrupt ſtate of things, " human laws are *neceſſary* to enforce the " divine law—that thoſe who *wilfully* live " together as *man* and *wife*, without this are " deſervedly reckoned infamous—that to diſ- " courage, and even to *puniſh* ſuch a con- " duct, is certainly within the *authority* of all " *civil government*—that, without *this*," i. e. ſome kind of marriage-ceremony, " men and " women would be living like the beaſts of " the field." Then, THELYPH, I tell you, that if thoſe who live together as man and wife, without any kind of marriage-ceremony, live like the beaſts of the field, you have given us but a beaſtly deſcription of marriage. But why are human laws neceſſary? Was not Moſes as well informed of the corrupted ſtate of human nature as you are? If God ſaw fit to leave the buſineſs of marriage, as at firſt ordained, to the one ſimple act of union,

without

without the leaſt hint of any marriage-ſervice, pray, who are you, THELYPH, that dare to ſet up your poſt againſt his pillar,—to prop up the weakneſs of, and add the ſanction of your *affirmance* to, his divine inſtitution, which, it ſeems, cannot eſcape the imputation of being infamous, without the anointing oil of ſome *human contrivance?* But again, if thoſe who wilfully live together as *man* and *wife*, without the *notoriety* of ſome *marriage-ceremony*, are deſervedly reckoned *infamous*, muſt not their *firſt* coming together without it be equally *infamous?* And what then can be concluded,—but that you have given the world an *infamous* deſcription of the inſtitution of marriage? and, like a worthy doctor of the Sorbonne yourſelf, you have repreſented the perfect ſyſtem of divine laws, to be ſo lame and feeble as to beg an alms of *human contrivances*, to *affirm* and *enforce* them.

Nor is he any more conſiſtent in his chapter of the true ORIGIN and NECESSITY of MARRIAGE-CEREMONY, in Vol. III. where, p. 309. he ſays, " It is the effect of that *ne-*
" *ceſſity* which mankind laboured under, to
" ſecure themſelves againſt the villany,
" treachery, and deceit of one another—

" that, on this account, the adventitious cir-
" cumſtances of human ceremony became
" *neceſſary.*" But, what doth this imply?—either that the DIVINE INSTITUTOR was remiſs in his care of the *weaker ſex*, from an indifference reſpecting *their* ſecurity, or not being appriſed of the deceitfulneſs of the human heart; or elſe THELYPH'S account of the *marriage-inſtitution* is not *right.* But, he who foreſaw what *would* be in man, and called him a tranſgreſſor from the womb, and knew that he would deal very treacherouſly *, inſtituted marriage, a more rational and humane covenant, which includes all that notoriety which is neceſſary to render it honourable in the ſight of men, and the mutual *ſecurity* of the married pair. This, in the *Scriptures*, is called *betrothing* and *eſpouſing:* and this, containing the very eſſence of marriage, as we have ſeen already from Deut. xxii. 24. leaves THELYPH'S trothleſs and treacherous buſineſs under the ſtigma of ſomething that defileth. But here I ſhall be ſent again to Exod. xxii. 16.—To which I anſwer,—Moſes wrote no ſoleciſms; he does not command

* Iſaiah xlviii. 8.

the

the *man* to marry his *wife*, but to take the *woman* he had defiled *to be* his *wife*: therefore it is plain, that THELYPH has ſpoken too mildly of ſuch an act, by *only* ſaying *, "That the woman who delivers her perſon "into the poſſeſſion of a man without the "*ceremony*, does not act a cautious, proper, "and wiſe part." But I ſay again, Moſes wrote no SOLECISMS; it is you that do that. But farther, pray what is *ſin*, if the acting an improper and unwiſe part is not? Is it not unlawful to throw temptations in our neighbour's way? and what better is the want of caution in the woman, who delivers her perſon into the poſſeſſion of a man in a luſtful and ſecret manner, but giving him the *opportunity*, and ſo *tempting* him to take the advantage of her diſgraceful ſituation? Nor can the *lender* of a large ſum of money in *private*, without ſecurity, be juſtly deemed otherwiſe than a tempter to him who borrows, and is, in ſome ſort, acceſſary to his villany, ſhould he deny the *debt*. And truly, THELYPH, it would amaze me to hear you ſay, "that "a court of juſtice would, in this caſe, re-

* Vol. iii. p. 312.

" dreſs the injury," if I had not ſo often found you inconſiderate and dozing.

Pray, was it with due conſideration that you imputed chicanery to the art of a *conveyancer* *? It would indeed be well, if, after all *his* care to be *explicit*, the *chicanery* of the *bar* could find no pretext to render doubtful the cleareſt titles.

Conſidering THELYPH'S flouriſhes on the *propriety* and *neceſſity* of MARRIAGE-CEREMONY, which is in his account † ſo important, as to render even what he eſteems the ſtate of marriage itſelf infamous without it, could any one ever ſuppoſe that he ſhould, after this, accuſe it with being ‡ " *an inſolent* " *attack upon the divine ſovereignty—a daring* " *invaſion of the divine prerogative of legiſla-* " *tion—a downright and open rebellion againſt* " *the majeſty of God?*"

But of all the ceremonies which ſuperſtition has invented, he preferreth that of the Hottentots §; becauſe, although none can be more indelicate and beaſtly, in his account, it is not ſo profane as thoſe of the Chriſtian

* Vol. iii. p. 311.
† See Vol. ii. p. 70.
‡ Vol. iii. p. 269.
§ Vol. iii. p. 268.

church.

church. In one reſpect he puts them upon a level, as he ſays, " they equally obſcure the " nature of what paſſes between a man and a " maid when ſhe is enticed and defiled by " him. But (ſays he) the Hottentot has this " advantage over the Chriſtian, though his " ceremony is not quite ſo cleanly, it is not " *lying in the name of the* LORD *." Now, Sir, I need not wiſh him to be more fallen and *ſquat* than he is. The ſalt lotion with which the Hottentot prieſt bedewed the *ſavage pair*, was as ambroſial as the ſcent of ſweeteſt flowers, and the form of the ceremony, decency itſelf, when compared with *that* into which his deluſive view of marriage has miſled him.

For, *1ſt*, If all marriage-ceremony is an inſolent attack upon the divine ſovereignty, to what a dilemma has he reduced mankind? they muſt either do this abominable thing, or he reckons their living together as *man* and *wife* to be *beaſtly* and *infamous*.

* Though the ceremony of marriage among the Hottentots was not too beaſtly, filthy, ridiculous, and abſurd, to find a page in *Thelyphthora*, we learn this from it, they did not come together *quite* like beaſts, without any ceremony at all.

Then, *2dly*, The woman who delivers her perſon into the poſſeſſion of a man, doth not act a *cautious*, proper, and *wiſe* part, unleſs ſhe firſt engages in a daring invaſion of the *divine prerogative* of *legiſlation*.

And, *3dly*, If a woman delivers her perſon into the poſſeſſion of a man without any ceremony firſt performed, he deems it a *pernicious tenet* to call her conduct *ſinful*; and yet, if they wilfully live together as *man* and *wife*, without complying with what he calls "a "downright and open rebellion againſt the "majeſty of GOD, they are deſervedly rec-"koned infamous—they live (ſays he) like "the beaſts of the field, and ought to be cut "off from the benefits of marriage."

So that marriage-ceremony, the ſon of *Superſtition*, being begot by *Neceſſity*, is at once an inſolent and daring blaſphemer of the majeſty, prerogative, and ſovereignty of GOD, and the beautifier of marriage; without which it is deſervedly reckoned infamous, beaſtly, and juſtly to be puniſhed by the civil magiſtrate. Is this to ſet forth the divine law as the contrivance of infinite wiſdom? Surely the ordinance of heaven is not ſo fallen as to need the fig-leaves of man's ſuperſtitious ceremony

to

to hide her nakedneſs: and therefore, THELYPH, I infer, that you have miſtaken the nature and purpoſe of GOD's inſtitution, and have been deluded and led aſtray by that falſe and illuſive

——wandering fire,
Compact of unctuous vapour, which the night
Condenſes, and the cold environs round,
Kindled through agitation to a flame;
Which oft, they ſay, ſome evil ſp'rit attends,
Hovering, and blazing with deluſive light,
Miſleads th' amaz'd night wand'rer from his way,
To bogs and mires, and oft through pond or pool,
There ſwallow'd up and loſt. MILTON.

Now, my dear Sir, I may ſafely conclude, that, notwithſtanding the Scriptures do not preſcribe any particular form of marriage-ceremony, there is no defect in the Divine inſtitution; nor can any inference from hence be fairly drawn, that the eſſence of marriage was made to conſiſt in the joining of the man and woman together, by the bands and ligaments only of a caſual, carnal, and trothleſs copulation. Nor are the ſacred Scriptures ſo ſilent as to this

matter as THELYPH aſſerts them to be. For Moſes, predicting the awful judgments of God that ſhould befal the Jewiſh church for their diſobedience, Deut. xxviii. 30. ſays, *Thou ſhalt* betroth *a* wife, *and another man ſhall* lie *with her.* And in Pſalm lxxviii. 63. the Pſalmiſt relates, that *the fire conſumed their young men*; and it is added, *their maidens were not* given, or praiſed *to marriage.* See alſo Malachi ii. 14. there marriage is called *a covenant:* which paſſages, though there were no others, are quite ſufficient to decypher what is marriage, according to the divine inſtitution, and ſhews it to be an honourable league, whereby the loving pair, agreeing with deareſt amity, are ſanctified or eſpouſed to each other with public notoriety; far differing from thoſe clandeſtine and deflowering embraces, that are the reſult of enticement and ſeduction, which is incompatible with every rational idea of marriage. But whether or not what I have ſaid ſhall *in* * *effect* only tell THELYPH and his *reverend correſpondent*, that his *book* is *right*, I now leave to their conſideration; and remain,

Dear Sir, *&c.*

* Vol. iii. Preface, p. 4. and note.

LETTER IX.

DEAR SIR,

AS it is the eſſential property of DIVINE TRUTH, ever to ſhine *glorious* in the majeſty of its own *evidence*, beaming forth from the ſacred pages, in perfect conſiſtence with itſelf; ſo is it the misfortune of ERROR, to be ever *weak* and *inglorious*, never blazing but with a deluſive light; betraying its *votaries* into the *dirt* and *ſoil* of *inconſiſtence* and *abſurdity*. Such an exhalation is THELYPHTHORA.

Several attempts have been made to cure him of his *lunacy*; but as yet he remains *qualis ab incepto*, and, JEHU-like, turns them all *behind him*, with a *quid curat* LUNA *latratus canum?* A literal truth.—As little alſo doth the ſilver *Queen* of *Heaven* regard the vulgar obſervation of men, that ſhe is *inconſtant* and *changeable*, and ſhines in a borrowed light. But, in theſe *qualities*, who can reſemble

reſemble the *moon* more than THELYPH, who is perpetually changing? Pray, what are his *notions* of *Polygamy*, but *moon-ſhine* reflected from that *luminary*, old Ochinus? He doth well, therefore, to relinquiſh the merit of any *new diſcoveries* on this head *.

I will ſelect one inſtance of this *lunar* verſatility: "Under the Old Teſtament (ſays he), "*Polygamy* was allowed in *all* caſes;" and, "had not *Polygamy* been allowed to *men*, the "proviſion for the protection and defence of "the *weaker ſex* had been deficient; where-"as God's law has made it complete; and "*no man upon earth* can, on the footing of "*that law*, plead his ſituation, either as a "privilege or a diſability againſt providing "for, maintaining and protecting as a *wife*, "*any* or *every* woman he may chuſe to ſe-"duce †." Here is a heap of words in the law ſtyle; no conveyancer can poſſibly be more explicit; and certainly here Polygamy is laid under no reſtraint whatſoever; and yet he is offended for its being ſo underſtood.

* Adv. vol. i. † Thel. vol. ii. (2d edit.) p. 289.

He

He now ſays *, " That indiſcriminate and " unlimited Polygamy is an idea as much " *abhorred* by *him* as by *his oppoſers*." But where has he diſcriminated? Where are his limits to be found? I can find no other limitation than what may be illuſtrated by the cuſtom of ſome manors where there is a right to common. The tenants, i. e. copy-holders, at the court-baron held before J. C. Eſq. ſteward of the manor, among other preſentments, of deaths, encroachments, &c. they preſent alſo, that no perſon ſhall be allowed to turn out more cattle than he can *couch* upon his commonable lands: and thus THELYPH may intend to limit our *nobility* and *gentry* within the bounds of their *income*, i. e. they muſt have no more *concubine wives* than they can *couch* upon their own eſtates, according to the cuſtom of the manor.

But another thing preſents itſelf and claims attention: " The learned *Grotius* (he ſays) " ſeems to intimate, that 1 Cor. vii. 4. is to " be relied on, as full in point, to prove the " unlawfulneſs of *Polygamy* amongſt *Chriſ-* " *tians*." This arouſes THELYPH; and if I

* Vol. iii. p. 371.

miſtake

miſtake not, he calls *Grotius* a *quibbler*, for preſuming to lay any ſtreſs on the words, *wife* and *huſband*, being in the ſingular number. " *Nevertheleſs*, to avoid *fornication*, *let* " *every man have his* own *wife*, *and every* " *woman her* own *huſband*. But ſuppoſe " (ſays he) it had been ſaid, " Let every " man have his *own* ſervant, and every ſer- " vant his *own* maſter," would it afford a " concluſive proof, that becauſe *no man can* " *ſerve two maſters*, therefore no maſter could " have *more than one* ſervant?" No, my good maſter *gooſe-cap*; but do you ſhew that there is any *ſimilarity* betwixt a *wife* and a *ſervant?* The *ſervant* hath no property in, nor can make any appropriation of his maſter's *perſon* or *goods* to himſelf, but the *wife* hath of *both*.

Here, again, the TRANSLATORS muſt have a kick, for introducing ſomething which is not in the *original* *; but I aſſure you, THELYPH,

* See Vol. i. p. 215. We have alſo, in p. 28. another inſtance of THELYPH's being addicted to *word-catching*. Our tranſlation reads Deut. xxii. 29. *The man ſhall give unto the damſel's father fifty ſhekels of ſilver*. " The word *ſhekels*," cries THELYPH, overlooking his ſubject, as if impatient to contradict, " is not in the original, but inſerted by our " Tranſ-

THELYPH, if a ſchool-boy had ſpent his ſchool-hours to no better purpoſe, he would have deſerved the *ferula*;—for, *in reſpect to the fornications*, tell us,—are we to *live in them?* or does the Apoſtle, as he had exhorted before, chap. vi. 18. teach us to *avoid* them?

I obſerve, that THELYPH has been very fond of introducing into his work the moſt palpable *errors* and *fooleries*; among the reſt, he introduces the ſect of the *Gnoſtics*, who held a community of *wives*, which was generally applauded and practiſed in Sparta *; and thought it became him gravely to confute this filthy hereſy: accordingly he lays down a general poſition, moſt pertinent, and abſolutely concluſive: "The *Spartans* are all "*adulterers*.—The *Gnoſtics* are *vanquiſhed*.—"But"—but what?—*no news*—THELYPH

"Tranſlators; it is fifty pieces of ſilver money;" and yet, p. 164. he accedes to the *ſenſe* of the *Tranſlators*, "and the "ſum of theſe pieces of ſilver money is *fifty ſhekels*." What do you deſerve for this? *Thou thyſelf haſt decided it*, p. 233. "All ſuch literal or verbal criticiſm is mere *word-catching*, "far beneath the dignity of fair argument, and deſerves *no-"thing but contempt*."

* Vol. i. p. 220.

has

has only expoſed his *heels* again, by furniſhing us with another argument, no leſs pertinent and concluſive againſt *himſelf*. "No "man (ſays he) can be ſaid to have an exclu- "ſive property in, or appropriation of *him- "ſelf* to, a perſon or thing which others may "ſhare with him *." This *axiom*, as it is *true*, ſo it is *univerſal:* therefore as no *man*, ſo no *woman* can be ſaid to have an excluſive property in, or appropriation to herſelf of, a perſon or thing which others may ſhare with her; ergo, THELYPH eſpying a Gnoſtic *fly* on the forehead of his ſweet child, *Polygamy*, hath, with one incautious blow, *killed them both* †. But it was a noble ſtroke, THELYPH, for henceforth ſhall every *woman* enjoy an excluſive right to her *own huſband*, and not have only an *eighth*, a *ſixteenth*, or it may be a *ſixty-fourth ſhare* in an *huſband*, as the brokers *divide* and *ſhare* lottery-tickets. "For aſſerting ſomething like this (he ſays), "that even the learned *Beza* will conde- "ſcend to talk *nonſenſe*;" and no wonder he ſays ſo, for he is ſo *coltiſh* ‡ as to imagine

* Vol. i. p. 230. (firſt edit.) p. 425. (firſt edit.) note.

† See vol. ii.

‡ Young or thoughtleſs.

that

that *Beza* repreſents a *Polygamiſt*, as Judges xix. 29. repreſents the *Levite's concubine*, whom he *divided* into *twelve* parts; "yet "(ſays he) the *Polygamiſts* we read of in "*Scripture* were as entire *individuals* as "thoſe who had but one *wife*." Now there is not a *broker* in Change-Alley but could have underſtood *Beza* better. The real *Goodluck*, I am ſure, knows how to *divide* a *ticket* into *twelve* equal *parts* or *ſhares*, without once ſuppoſing the paper to be *cut* into ſo many pieces; and can perfectly underſtand that no one of the *ſharers* can properly call the *whole ticket his own*. But this is only one evidence; whereas every word ſhould be eſtabliſhed by the witneſs of *two*: where ſhall we find the *ſecond?* why, Sir, THELYPH, as an *individual*, is compoſed of *two ſides*—a *witty* and *ſophiſtical* ſide, and a *witleſs* and *incautious* ſide; this *laſt* he preſents for our ſervice, vol. II. p. 188, 189. "*Polygamy*, "conſidered in itſelf (ſays he) is one of the "laſt things which a man ſhould think of— "becauſe of the DISTRACTIONS which moſt "probably MUST BE the effect of JEALOUSY "between the WOMEN, each ENVYING the "other her SHARE in the huſband's af-

" fections *." This is a fair acknowledgment, that, notwithſtanding a *Polygamiſt* is an entire individual, yet, as *Beza* ſays, " he " is *divided* into as *many parts as he has* " *wives;*" i. e. his *affections*, which are the ſublimeſt properties of his perſon, muſt be *divided* and *ſhared* amongſt them; therefore, as *Beza* certainly meant no more, we ſhall not ſcruple to return THELYPH his *phylactery of nonſenſe*, to be worn upon his own garment.

But, Sir, another *limb* of the *grand queſtion* to be tried, is, Whether *Polygamy* be really founded on the baſis of the DIVINE LAW, or not? To be rightly informed in the *hiſtory* of

* If the practice of *Polygamy* amongſt the firſt *Chriſtians* was ſo very frequent, as THELYPH thinks it probably was, (vol. i. p. 192.) the Apoſtle Paul muſt often have been a witneſs to thoſe *diſtractions* which we are told, " *muſt be* the " effect of *jealouſy* between the *women*, each *envying* the other " her SHARE in the *huſband*'s affections." How is it then, that, in all his *Epiſtles*, he never once hints at a remedy againſt an *evil* that is ſo peſtiferous to the Chriſtian life? The wives of a *Polygamiſt* may be *diſtracted* with jealouſies, envy, and contention, without being ſo much as informed what is their relative duty: Paul hath no *command* concerning them, nor doth he once give his *judgment* how they ought to behave towards each other. What can be the reaſon? It is plainly this,—becauſe it is a *relation* which is not *authorized* by the SCRIPTURES, or in other words, is not *founded* on the *baſis* of the DIVINE LAW.

mar-

marriage, the beſt courſe will be, to enquire, as our Saviour's direction is—*how it was in the beginning*. If the great Milton's judgment may be relied on, THELYPH, in his deſcription, hath miſtaken that which is only the *ſubordinate end of marriage*, for the *inſtitution*; or God's *bleſſing* on the married couple, for the *ordinance of marriage*. For the words of the *inſtitution* are theſe: *And the* LORD GOD *ſaid*, it is *not good that the man ſhould be alone: I will make him an help meet for him.—The* LORD *God made a woman, and brought her unto the man. And Adam ſaid, This is* now *bone of my bones, and fleſh of my fleſh: ſhe ſhall be called Woman, becauſe ſhe was taken out of man. Therefore ſhall a man leave his father and his mother, and ſhall cleave unto his wife, and* they *ſhall be one fleſh*, Gen. ii. 18. 24. explained, Matth. xix. 5. by *they twain*, or *they two*, the *man* and his *wife* *; *they ſhall be one fleſh*. Theſe words are plain: they contain the pattern of marriage, as inſtituted on the day of *Adam*'s eſpouſal to his conſorted *Eve*. Here is the pure fountain of all conjugal ſolace and delight. Here it is *reſtricted* to the *human pair:*

* See Thel. vol. i. p. 154.

two and *no more* were the ſubjects of this benefecent *inſtitution*—the product of infinite *clemency* and *wiſdom* in *God*, *conſulting* what was good for *man*; Who, ſtudious of our PEACE, here turns our thoughts *from vain and vile, to ſolid and ſublime* *.

Polygamy, then, it is evident, is not founded on the *baſis* of this *primary inſtitution*. THELYPH therefore may toil "*in ſubtile ſophiſtry's laborious forge*," until he faints, or is choaked with his own duſt and ſweat; common ſenſe will never be perſuaded that by *they twain*, or the *man* and his *wife*, is intended one *man* and any indefinite number of *wives*, from *two*, to *four times two hundred and fifty*. Men indeed may *cobble* and *vamp*, and *alter* and *repeal* laws; but it is agreed, that it cannot be ſo with OMNISCIENCE. GOD *is a Rock: His Word is very pure, and his work is perfect*. On this foundation then we ſtand, and firmly conclude, that, as *Polygamy* is contrary to the *pattern* of the *primary inſtitution* of *marriage*; it is not any where *founded* on the *divine law:* nor hath THELYPH at all proved that it is. Indeed, he ſays

* Young's Night-Thoughts.

it

it, and ſays it, again and again; but how does he prove it? *riſum teneatis*, by impreſſing three texts *, which ſay nothing in its favour, and denying that the Scriptures ſay any thing againſt it. But I ſhall only tell him my thoughts of the *Levirate*, or law of *marrying the brother's wife* †. I am pleaſed to find him reſting ſo much of his *cauſe* here; becauſe, let him ſay what he will about it, *it* affords him nothing but *conjectures* and *probabilities*: but were it as *certain* as he could wiſh it to be, this *law*, with all its reaſons, *ceaſed* on the diſperſion of the ten tribes, or at lateſt, with the Jewiſh polity.

I cannot ſee what advantage THELYPH could propoſe to himſelf by placing *Tamar* in the light of a *betrothed* woman ‡: however, by his unſkilful ſurgery, he hath rankled *Judah*'s inceſtuous fornication into *adultery*; which ſurely can have no tendency to render the offſpring more *legitimate*: which reminds me of that daring *revery* of his, reſpecting the legitimacy of HIM who is emphatically

* Exod. xxi. 10. Deut. xxi. 15. Deut. xxv. 5.

† See vol. iii. p. 378.

‡ Vol. iii. p. 397.

ſtyled the *ſeed* of Abraham *. THELYPH certainly ſtands here in a very *ſingular* point of view. If we conſider *Polygamy* with reſpect to its inexpediency, he himſelf hath *vilified* it even to *execration* †: but on the other hand, ſee how the *pigmy* towers! "If *Polygamy* be "not founded on the *baſis* of the DIVINE "LAW, *your faith is vain, ye are yet in your* "*ſins*—CHRIST cannot be HE *that was to* "*come, but* (ſays he) *we muſt look for an-* "*other* ‡." This is a ſtrong *puſh* made; but it is *only* an human *effort*. DIVINE WISDOM hath decided the matter againſt him. THELYPH!

——look up,
And read thy lot in yon celeſtial ſign,
Where thou art weigh'd—"

For it is written, *He taketh the wiſe in their own craftineſs:* therefore give him his point, and you *involve* him more; he muſt then prove *Phares* to be the *legitimate* ſon of *Judah*; or ſtill we want the true *Meſſiah*, the *ſeed* of *Abraham*, which is *Chriſt:* and *when*

* Gen. xxvi. 4. and xxviii. 14. compared with Acts iii. 25. and Gal. iii. 16. *and to thy* ſeed, *which* is CHRIST.

† Vol. iii. p. 370. ‡ Vol. ii. p. 21.

he

he hath done, *ſtill* he hath *not* done; he muſt *reconcile* two *irreconcileables*, that is, *both* the parts of a *contradiction* *.

Thus hath THELYPH been vamping *ſilly* arguments together, *without* reflection; like thoſe *idolaters*, *who helped every one his neighbour; and every one ſaid unto his brother, Be of good courage: ſo the carpenter encouraged the goldſmith, and he that ſmootheth with the hammer, him that ſmote the anvil, ſaying, It is ready for the ſodering; and he faſtened it with nails that it ſhould not be moved* †; but all in vain;

* See vol. II. p. 19. There THELYPH expreſſeth his opinion "that *David*'s child, begotten of *Bathſheba* in *adultery*, "was not *his ſon* in the legal ſenſe of the word, becauſe a "*baſtard*." And in vol. III. p. 397. *Phares*, who was begotten by *Judah* of *Tamar*, is brought into the ſame *predicament*: which ſheweth him to be but an *incautious* and *preſumptuous* reaſoner on the ways of God, who knows how to over-rule even the *ſins* of his creatures, to the more illuſtrious manifeſtation of his own SOVEREIGN GRACE. But as THELYPH hath reaſoned away the precious title of CHRIST as ABRAHAM'S SEED, we cannot but infer him to be moſt *abſurd* and *reaſonleſs*. N. B. If *Phares* is not *improperly* inſerted in the genealogies of *Matthew* and *Luke*, POLYGAMY may be conſidered as an *offence* againſt the *inſtitution of marriage*; and it nevertheleſs remain an evident truth, that our LORD ſprang out of *Judah*, and is as truly the SON of DAVID as he is the SEED of ABRAHAM.

† Iſaiah xli. 6, 7.

they

they can no more abide a *Scripture* trial, than the *Philiſtine Dagon* could ſtand of old,

——when the captive ark
Maim'd his brute image, head and hands lopt off
In his own temple, on the grunſel edge
Where he fell flat, and ſham'd his worſhippers.

But, to conclude, THELYPH hath not been *ambling* forth, merely to diſplay his different paces, but for a *public good*; firſt, he ſays, "to check the overflowings of *adultery*;" well done; rather, will not Polygamy tend to promote *adultery?* If a woman will not be *ſatisfied* with her *own* huſband, is it more likely that ſhe *would* with an eighth or a ſixteenth *ſhare* of him? Again, is it for a public good, that Chriſtian families ſhould be *diſtracted* with *jealouſies* and *diſcontent?* In fine, is there no way to reſtrain *adultery* and *proſtitution*, without an allowance of *Polygamy*, which even THELYPH terms no leſs than an *execrable* remedy *? ſo that, if a *farmer* had

* And yet he *ſets* it forth as *founded* on the *baſis* of the DIVINE LAW.

Abſolve we *this*, what then is *blaſphemy!*
Young's NIGHT-THOUGHTS.

many *wives*, he might envy the very *cock* upon his dunghill, that

——with lively din,
Scatters the rear of darkneſs thin,
And to the ſtack or the barn's door,
Stoutly ſtruts, his dames before.

Wherefore the leaſt that can be ſaid of THELYPHTHORA is, that it is written *on* falſe principles, and *falſe ideas of utility*.

THE END.

many writers, he might envy the very ease
upon his dunghill, that

—— with lively din,
Scatters the rear of darkness thin,
And to the stack or the barn's door,
Stoutly struts his dames before.

Wherefore the land that can be said of
THEOPHRASTUS is, that it [illegible] written on
[illegible], no [illegible] of [illegible]

THE END